

ED 023 125

By-Teague, Dutton, Ed., Buck, Dorothy P., Ed.

Developing Programs in the Helping Services Field Experience, Methods Courses, Employment Implications.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.

Spons Agency-Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Sep 68

Note-46p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.40

Descriptors-*Curriculum Development, Employment Opportunities, *Mental Health, *Undergraduate Study, Workshops

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), interested in manpower in mental health and related areas, has focused upon encouraging the development of undergraduate programs in the helping services. This first phase has been most effective, and numerous programs have emerged throughout the western states. The emphasis must now be upon strengthening these many new programs which have begun or are emerging. As a first major step in this direction, WICHE hosted a workshop for directors of undergraduate programs in the western states. This workshop focused upon the primary concerns as expressed by the program directors: (1) the effective development of a field experience, (2) rationale for, and considerations in, developing methods courses, and (3) employment considerations for the graduate with a baccalaureate degree. This publication, utilizing the papers from the workshop, was developed to add to the accumulating information, considerations, and approaches in the crucial areas of program development and manpower utilization in the helping services. (AUTHOR)

WESTERN COUNCIL ON MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Leo F. Cain, President, California State College at Dominguez, Dominguez Hills, California

***Dr. John D. Cambareri**, Director, Comprehensive State Planning, Idaho State Department of Public Health, Boise

Angie Connor, M. D., Professor of Public Health, University of Hawaii

Sumiko Fujiki, Director, Graduate Program in Psychiatric Nursing, College of Nursing, University of Utah

Herbert S. Gaskill, M.D., Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, School of Medicine

James Grobe, M.D., Maryvale Clinic, Phoenix, Arizona

***Dr. Gordon Hearn**, Dean, School of Social Work, Portland State College, Portland, Oregon

Dr. Garrett Heyns, Olympia, Washington

Ward C. Holbrook, Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Corrections, Utah Department of Public Welfare, Salt Lake City

Dr. Irving Katz, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Psychology, Nevada Southern University, Las Vegas

J. Ray Langdon, M.D., Anchorage, Alaska

***Ralph Littlestone**, Chief of Planning, California Department of Mental Hygiene, Sacramento

***Dr. Horace Lundberg**, Dean, Graduate School of Social Service Administration, Arizona State University, Tempe

Dr. Eugene Mariani, Director of Professional Services, New Mexico Department of Public Welfare, Santa Fe

Judd Marmor, M.D., Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, University of California at Los Angeles

Dr. E. K. Nelson, Professor, University of Southern California School of Public Administration

Dr. Richard A. Posewark, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Wyoming

Stanley J. Rogers, M.D., Superintendent and Director, Division of Mental Hygiene, Montana State Hospital, Warm Springs

Samuel Schiff, M.D., Chief, Staff Development Department, Ft. Logan Mental Health Center, Fort Logan, Colorado

William Sears, M.D., Los Vegas, New Mexico

Dr. Rex A. Skidmore, Dean, University of Utah School of Social Work, Salt Lake City

***Dr. Charles R. Strother**, Professor of Psychology, University of Washington

John H. Waterman, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, University of Oregon; WICHE Field Consultant, GP Programs

***Executive Committee Member**

Dr. Robert H. Kroepsch, WICHE Executive Director

Raymond Feldman, M.D., WICHE Associate Director for Regional Programs (Mental Health)

ED 023 / 25 -

**DEVELOPING PROGRAMS IN THE
HELPING SERVICES:
FIELD EXPERIENCE, METHODS COURSES,
EMPLOYMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Edited by
Dutton Teague
and
Dorothy P. Buck

The program described in this publication was supported in part
by Rehabilitation Services Administration Grant No. 622-T-67.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
University East Campus Boulder, Colorado 80302

September, 1968

ED 023 123-
003 029

FOREWORD

WICHE's interest in manpower in mental health and related areas has focused upon encouraging the development of undergraduate programs in the helping services. This first phase has been most effective, and numerous programs have emerged throughout the western states.

The emphasis must now focus upon strengthening these many new programs which have begun or are emerging. As a first major step in this direction, WICHE hosted a workshop for directors of undergraduate programs in the western states. This workshop focused upon the primary concerns as expressed by the program directors; 1) the effective development of a field experience, 2) rationale for and considerations in developing methods courses, and 3) employment considerations for the graduate with a baccalaureate degree.

This publication, utilizing the papers from the workshop, was developed to add to the accumulating information, considerations, and approaches in the crucial areas of program development and manpower utilization in the helping services.

Raymond Feldman, M.D.
Director, Mental Health and
Related Areas
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education

Boulder, Colorado
September, 1968

CONTENTS

Current Conceptualizations of the B.A. Level Practitioner in Human Services: Implications for Undergraduate Education . . . 1 Thomas L. Briggs, A.C.S.W.	
Learning Through Field Experience Margaret B. Matson, Ph.D.	15
Content for Methods Courses in Undergraduate Curricula for the Helping Services 25 Joan Acker, Ph.D.	
Pariticipants	36

CURRENT CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF THE B.A. LEVEL PRACTITIONER IN HUMAN SERVICES: IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION*

**Thomas L. Briggs, A.C.S.W.
Associate Professor and Director
Division of Continuing Education and Manpower Development
Syracuse University School of Social Work**

The scarcity of manpower in the professions and technical occupations is one of the most serious problems facing the modern world. What is done about it will largely determine the quality of tomorrow's society and will certainly determine the nature of tomorrow's professions. The answers are needed soon, because each day the professional manpower pool in proportion to need is growing smaller. To demonstrate, the *Manpower Report of the President*¹ issued in 1967 stated that there were currently 9.3 million professional and technical employees in the United States, but that by 1975 there must be 13 million such employees just to keep pace with the present quality and quantity of professional services. This 40 percent increase must be achieved in the next seven years, but such an expansion would require costly and laborious efforts at best and the nation does not seem to be in a spending mood. Even if the increase is achieved, it will be insufficient. Society cannot indefinitely afford the kind of social problems it has experienced in the past few years, and needed changes will require much more than simply functioning at *present* levels. Far more than a 40 percent increase in professional and technical manpower is the necessary goal.

It is a necessary but unrealistic goal. By 1975, the *Manpower Report* goes on, five million college graduates are expected to enter the professional and technical occupations. This number could be reduced to a substantial extent if abolishment of student deferments from the military draft comes to full fruition. The report says that twice as many people must enter the professions as are now projected to keep pace with present needs. Undergraduate and professional schools, however, are simply not capable of absorbing such an increase in such a short time and still maintain adequate training standards.

Manpower Crises in Social Work

The situation in social work is typical of all the other professions and is, in many ways, an even more alarming problem. Government projections² estimate that there will be 100,000 professional social work vacancies in the United States in 1970. Still another government report says that by 1975 there will be 178,000 professional social work vacancies.³ In short, instead of a 40 percent increase needed in the next seven years, a 300 percent increase is needed to meet social service demands, and a 150 percent increase must be achieved in less than two years. The nation's schools of social work currently graduate a little over 4,000 M.S.W.s each year, and this number is only about eight percent of the present number of professional social workers.

* Grateful acknowledgement is made to Dr. Lester Glick and Dr. Robert L. Barker who assisted in the preparation of this material.

To fill these vacancies, social work must draw from the same limited reservoir of potential recruits from which all other professions obtain their future members. Clearly the competitive position of social work compared to other professions is not a good one, and the competition will inevitably grow more intense as the manpower crisis continues. One indicator of this is the fact that the percentage of graduate students in schools of social work compared to all graduate students has been going down each year for the past 15 years despite numerical increases in the numbers of social work students.⁴ In other words, manpower deficiencies are very serious for all professions, but how much more so are they for those groups which do not even maintain their positions relative to the other professions?

To keep pace with current needs, to catch up with former manpower deficiencies, and to increase the services to the level recommended by social scientists, the schools would have to increase their capacities four-fold. Nearly 250 new schools, each as big as existing ones, would have to be founded. Obviously, with all the difficulties there are in organizing new schools or expanding existing ones, there is little likelihood that such achievements will be forthcoming.

Statistics such as these have been cited with such regularity of late that their effect is less likely to arouse the professions than to evoke a response of apathy or dubiousness. On the other hand, there may be some within the professional ranks who are content with the fact that many jobs are unfilled and actually take pride in the fact that a manpower shortage exists. Undoubtedly, part of this stance is generated by the belief that a profession's prestige is enhanced as its popularity grows—as it illustrates to the world that its services are in such great demand that there are too few people to meet that demand. This is particularly true of the newer professions which have not yet achieved a high level of prestige and unique responsibility such as library science, urban planning, and social work as contrasted with the more established ones like medicine and law.

Social work is similar to other professions in its quest for greater eminence, and it is developing a tradition which strives for a great deal of exclusivity.⁵ It has sought to restrict full professional status to those with master's degrees, and it has long advocated that most positions which provide social services should be performed by those with the graduate degree. Yet all the while it has been raising educational standards, the manpower shortages have become more critical, and there is evidence that society may withdraw its mandate unless the profession is able to "deliver the goods." It is impossible to continually bemoan manpower shortages and simultaneously try to remain a closed shop. In other words, despite the fact that manpower shortages may be caused in part by the profession itself and may serve its "prestige" interests and also that those who would like to do something about it are skeptical that it can be tackled, it is a problem demanding resolution.

There are at least three reasons for holding to the view that the manpower crisis among professional social workers is bad and getting worse. In the first place, despite the proclamation that all social service jobs should be performed by professional social workers, three out of every four social

work positions are now filled by those without master's degrees. Secondly, of those who are M.S.W.s, there is an ever increasing proportion moving into private practice positions and into private social agencies, and a declining number who are employed in public agencies where the implementation of social services and requirement for personnel is greatest. Finally, social legislation is increasing at a rapid rate, with 50 major bills, each requiring more professional manpower, having been passed by the U.S. Congress since 1960.

Proposed Solutions to the Manpower Crises

What is to be done about that problem? Obtaining more prestige and more pay, and employing more refined recruitment techniques are not the whole answer because of the inevitable bottleneck in the schools of social work. Attempting to expand the schools is not the whole answer because of limited funds, lack of potential faculty members, and the necessarily slow development that new or expanding schools must undergo. Reducing the time it takes to obtain the professional degree is not the answer, especially in light of the knowledge explosion which has led many educators to suggest that there is not enough time in two years to impart the available findings. If anything, they say, the length of graduate training should be increased. Finding more efficient means of service delivery—through automation, systematizing need provision in such ways as the guaranteed annual income, overhauling the public assistance program, and so forth—is not the whole answer because of the enormous initial costs involved and the general public antipathy to such drastic social changes. Re-educating professional social workers to focus their attention on those activities which are exclusively within their province, rather than giving most of their attentions to those activities which are being met by other professional groups, is not the answer because people are going to work at the kind of job they like best despite exhortations to the contrary. All of these, of course, are partial answers, and efforts toward their implementation must occur, but they alone will not suffice. Given their limitations something else must be done.

Differential Utilization of Personnel

The most reasonable answer to the manpower problem lies in the systematic utilization of people without professional degrees. Whether to use nonM.S.W.s in social work positions should be a dead issue, for they are being employed in increasing numbers every year. But the dispute has not ended because of the widespread view that officially sanctioning their utilization in social work will result in a decline in the quality of the services rendered by the profession and the degree of prestige which the profession can muster. The protection of standards is deemed a more important issue than the delivery of service. Many, if not most, social agencies cling precariously to the notion that the nonM.S.W. is merely an expedient, holding his job only until the M.S.W. may be employed. Because he is viewed this way, no attention is given to finding ways of using him to provide many of those needed client services which do not require the skills inherent in graduate training.

Probably much of the lack of acceptance for sanctioning the nonM.S.W. utilization is the result of the fear of losing prestige rather than losing quality. Agencies often strive toward full M.S.W. staffing because it enhances prestige, and they give only secondary consideration to whether such a personnel structure is optimal. Those agencies which do use nonM.S.W.s often do so with the rationale that they will soon be replaced by M.S.W.s. They feel that, if they don't maintain such goals, it is a reflection that the agency has poor standards and that the services it renders are somehow less than adequate.

Actually nonM.S.W.s pose a threat precisely because they have not been used differentially—since they have been used interchangeably. What they do is often indistinguishable from what the fully trained professional does. NonM.S.W.s have been referred to in the field as "untrained workers," a status which is most dysfunctional to the profession, for it implies that persons are engaged in professional activities while at the same time lacking professional educational training. The field has responded to this threat by attempting to eliminate all nonM.S.W.s from the field, rather than eliminating the position and creating a unique, worthwhile, challenging role for those without the graduate degree. The question *should not be whether* to use the nonM.S.W., but *how* to use him.

The B.A. Level Practitioner

The question of *how* to utilize nonM.S.W.s is vastly complicated. The trouble is that social service provision is a rather abstract and wide ranging activity, much more so than that of other professions. The many studies in social work⁶ published in the past 10 years bears testimony to this fact. Of those studies that have been reported, the major focus has been attempting to find better, more effective patterns of utilization of the baccalaureate graduate in social work delivery systems.

B.A. level practitioners constitute the largest single group in human services manpower and will continue to be the major manpower resource in the foreseeable future, therefore attention to this level of personnel should have the highest priority. Two hopeful developments, in the last several years by two federal agencies to tackle the problem of differential use of B.A. level practitioners, have occurred and, since they represent quite opposite approaches, will be reported on briefly.

The Social Work Assistant in the Veterans Administration

The Veterans Administration, which is the largest single employer of M.S.W.s in the country and is almost exclusively staffed with graduate trained social workers, established three years ago the social work assistant position for graduates of liberal arts colleges. According to program guides and job descriptions, this person was viewed as a technician or helper of the professional. He performed discrete tasks of a routine nature in nonsensitive areas of client services under the close supervision of the M.S.W. He never had complete responsibility for a "case" or carried a "case load." He was also involved in a considerable amount of "paper oriented" activity. Some 30

V.A. facilities currently have assistants assigned to their social service departments⁷ and evidence is accumulating that these individuals have talents and interests that exceed the limitations specified in the formal statements emanating from central office. The trend has been to give these persons more responsibility, and the degree of autonomy and independent judgment exercised has expanded.⁸

Two major deficits of this attempt to differentially use B.A. persons has emerged in the V.A. experience. First, the formal limitations of this position, if actually adhered to, present limited challenging career opportunities for college graduates. Second, the unit of differentiation as utilized in this approach is the "task" and, as well documented elsewhere, there are many problems in using such a concept in establishing differential assignments.

The Two Career Lines of the Bureau of Family Service

The second federal agency interested in the issue of differential use of B.A. and M.S.W. practitioners was the now defunct Bureau of Family Service. As the national standard-setting agency for public welfare departments, the bureau, as might be expected, was extremely interested in the college graduate as public agencies are the largest single employers of this level personnel. Predictably, their approach was quite different from the V.A., and their solution to the manpower deployment issue was to create two career lines, one for B.A.s, called social workers, and another for M.S.W.s, called graduate social workers.⁹ In this scheme the B.A. was considered a member of a separate occupational group, therefore capable of practicing autonomously. Career opportunities were available to them, and they could move up the ladder from practitioner to supervisor to administrator. Similar opportunities were available to the M.S.W.s. Implicit in this model was the deployment of B.A.s and M.S.W.s in separate and different services. Since they were not utilized together, the B.A. was not considered a technician, ancillary to the professional.

The unit of differentiation in this scheme was the "case" and the kinds of services required. There are many reasons why this approach ran into difficulties, including underutilization of the M.S.W.s and overutilization of B.A.s, and this is documented elsewhere. The major benefit of this development, however, was that the bureau, like V.A., attempted to create a new status other than "untrained worker" for the B.A. practitioner. A deliberate attempt was made to differentially utilize two levels of personnel on some basis other than administrative expediency and, though problems emerged as these schemes were operationalized, this must be viewed historically as a beginning breakthrough in the manpower dilemma.

Conceptualizations of the B.A. Level Practitioner Emerging from Manpower Research Projects

Another conceptualization of the B.A. which seems to be emerging in several major manpower research-demonstration projects in social work is the bachelor's degree level person as a *beginning professional* or at least

a *technician-specialist* in some area of client service. He is usually cast in the role of member of a social work team where the relationships between B.A. and M.S.W. are structured with rather clear-cut distinctions regarding roles and function. (This movement in social work is quite similar to developments in nursing. In the last 15 years nursing has moved from a case approach to nursing care, to a functional approach [task], to the development of the nursing team to organize and deliver nursing services.)¹⁰

The social work team basically consists of several members of the social service staff working together for the attainment of common professional goals. As operationalized, these goals of service are determined by the professional member of the team, i.e., the M.S.W. who acts as team leader, but the rendering of services may be assigned to various members of the team including the B.A. level person. Though this is a flexible arrangement and teams differ in composition in various agencies and research projects, the team always consists of at least one M.S.W. and one or more social service personnel who do not have M.S.W. training.

The advantages of the social work team are many; the most important advantage is that it allows for the flexible use of the competencies and expertise of various personnel, and one person need not be all things to his client as the "case approach" requires. Additionally, the team approach structures into the service delivery system the professional "know how" and value orientations so that the B.A., or other levels of subprofessional personnel, need not be expected to have completely internalized the profession's value system and fully mastered the bodies of knowledge required to meet the wide range of needs clients may bring to the agency.

In team operations the unit of differentiation has been a combination of case and task. Members of the team carry a portion of the team's case load and offer a continuity of service, but various service requirements are often assigned to more than one member of the team depending on the nature of the problem, the service required and the particular expertise of the individual practitioner. In the Midway Project, for example, the unit of differentiation was called the Unit of Service.¹¹ In the National Association of Social Workers (N.A.S.W.) Manpower Project it was called the Episode of Service (E.O.S.).¹² An E.O.S. began when a particular need was identified. The M.S.W. then validated the goal of service as consistent with agency goals, made judgments and decisions regarding the means to carry out the goal and the staff resources to be involved.

Levels of Intervention

In the N.A.S.W. project there still remained the question of who on the team should the team leader select to render a specific service? Was there some generalization or conceptual approach that would say, for example: given this client, with this need, requiring this type of social service, "X" level worker should be assigned as contrasted with "Y" level? Social work theorists are hard at work at the development of such criteria and one attempt at this, by David Levine¹³ seems to have much merit and was utilized in the N.A.S.W. study.

According to Levine, social work practice can be conceived of as intervention into the life processes of individuals, groups, and communities for the purpose of maintaining, enhancing, or restoring social functioning. The intervention is seen as occurring at four different levels on an ascending order of complexity but descending order of primacy for survival. These levels are need-provision, problem-solving, conflict-resolution, and systems change and may be conceived of as the full range of social work activities. During the course of the N.A.S.W. manpower study, which involved a field demonstration of experimental models and conceptual approaches in an actual operating agency, the concept levels of intervention emerged as a valid criterion, a sort of conceptual handle, by which to differentiate assignments between B.A.s and M.S.W.s.

Levels 1 and 2, need provision and problem-solving, were activities that a B.A. with a general liberal arts background could be taught to perform with a reasonable amount of in-service training. The other levels emerged as the almost exclusive province of the M.S.W. practitioner. It is the belief of the authors that a major proportion of social services in this country require intervention at levels 1 and 2 and, if a cadre of B.A.s could be more specifically educated at the undergraduate level to function at this level, a dent in the manpower crisis may occur.

The following material represents the point of view of one school of social work, Syracuse University, as it has utilized theoretical approaches developed in manpower research in their attempts to construct vital programs in the human services at the undergraduate level.¹⁴

Undergraduate Philosophy Screen

If the baccalaureate worker is to continue as the chief reservoir for social work manpower in the years to come, greater attention must be given to his education and to the delivery system which utilizes his services. What, then, should be his education, and for what kind of services should he be prepared to perform? The following represents one school's attempt to answer these questions.

1. The B.A. level practitioner needs a broad general education buttressed with an emphasis on communication skills, both verbal and written. The first year or two of his college education should include language, natural science, history, literature, and various courses in communications.
2. The B.A. practitioner should have a broad comprehension of the social and behavioral sciences as the foundation upon which the social work education, per se, is built.
3. The baccalaureate graduate, who plans to enter a social service delivery system immediately upon graduation, should have sufficient knowledge about intervention processes to participate constructively as a beginner on a social service team.
4. The educational process for the B.A. and M.S.W. worker must arise out of a conceptualization of education and practice which permits an explicit

continuum. If education is to be useful, it must be relevant for the type of functions the practitioner is called upon to perform.

Education for Practice at Various Levels of Intervention

Social work education at all levels of the continuum, including undergraduate education, has the task of preparing practitioners to intervene into the life processes of individuals, groups, and communities for the purposes of maintaining, enhancing, and/or restoring social functioning. As covered previously, there are various levels of intervention. They are to (1) meet basic human needs; (2) solve and manage problems; (3) identify, utilize, and resolve conflict; and (4) bring about systems change. For each level of intervention there is a corresponding body of knowledge, accompanying value orientations, and a skill component. The following represents an attempt to spell out and to suggest what are appropriate goals for undergraduate vis a vis graduate education:

LEVEL 1: Meet Basic Human Needs

Meeting basic human needs connotes the provision of food, clothing, shelter, jobs, meaningful human relationships, and other concrete services as applied to human systems.

Knowledge

The knowledge component at this level requires of the practitioner an understanding of normal human functioning (eufunctioning) of individuals, groups, and communities, and the cultural matrix in which these systems operate. This connotes an awareness of the components of the whole person concept as consisting of physical, social, emotional, and aspirational and the social worker's special area of knowledge as it relates to man's social functioning. The practitioner should know what is normal growth and development at each stage of the life cycle.

Knowledge at this level should include an understanding of the normal economic, political, cultural, and other social systems, and reflect on how these systems enhance the individual's potential for self actualization and need fulfillment.

In addition, the learner should be cognizant of the institutionalized and informal resources in the community to meet human need. Therefore he should have an understanding of both the human service agencies and the nature of professions as a means to supply need.

The educational components to meet need are experienced by the learner in life in addition to the relevant formalized education which occurs at all levels of education. By the time the learner completes his baccalaureate education, he should have some depth understanding of man's needs and how they may be supplied through various community resources.

Values

The value (attitude) components necessary to perform at this level of intervention require an identification with those values broadly held by

persons in the helping professions in a democratic society and held particularly by M.S.W. social workers.

Skills

The skill component requires that the practitioner comprehend the normal and "healthy" functioning of all human systems and subsequently can identify those systems which are dysfunctional. He also needs to have skill in human relationships sufficient to be supportive in the efforts of the client to meet his own needs.

LEVEL 2: Solve and Manage Problems

The second level of intervention, to solve and manage problems, refers to the process of evaluating and acting upon blocks which interfere with goal achievement. Successful problem-solving is requisite for adequate human functioning in that crises and frustrations are universal phenomena to the human condition. When a person is over-protected from these adversities, he does not develop skill in problem-solving; conversely if he is constantly overwhelmed by difficulties he loses motivation and chooses mechanisms of defense which are nonintegrative.

Some generalized types of problems which clients frequently present are as follows: unawareness of antecedent condition; lack of consideration of problem-solving methods based on the scientific method; lack of objectification of the problem through verbalization; personalization of a problem which is societal rather than personal.

Knowledge

One important body of knowledge for problem-solving is the scientific method which provides a method for problem-identification, analysis, and hypothesis-testing. When applied to various human systems it permits an understanding of the concepts of prediction, cause, and consequence and establishes boundaries for normalcy for a given situation. Furthermore it provides a basis for understanding inductive and deductive processes and enhances the learner's potential to think and write succinctly and precisely.

Problem-solving is premised on communications skills and a knowledge of interviewing techniques.

Problems of individuals, groups, and communities are frequently an extension of a larger social problem which affects sizeable segments of population. Therefore at this level of intervention the practitioner should have beginning knowledge of such social problems as poverty, discrimination, mental illness, and delinquency. He needs to have an understanding of theories of their causation and prevention in addition to hypothesizing how they might be ameliorated.

Values

For performance on intervention level 2 the practitioner need not only identify with such social work values as confidentiality and self determination but should use them spontaneously and consistently.

Skills

At this level the practitioner is in the process of consolidating his communication skills. His orientation to the scientific methods should permit him to participate in the analysis of problems and make certain predictions based on a priori conditions.

Through his understanding of normal human behavior, he should be able to observe certain deviations and hypothesize about possible outcomes. His understanding of the social problems should permit him to operate within a limited range of options with a client system.

Levels 1 and 2 might be identified by the profession of social work as the chief service domain for the baccalaureate worker. However, education and skill are not discrete. The baccalaureate worker needs to have a cognitive understanding of the entire continuum of practice and intervention procedures.

LEVEL 3: Identify, Utilize, and Resolve Conflict

Conflict arises when there are discrepancies between the expectations of an individual, group, or community. Typically, the conflict is enhanced by high emotion and possible unconscious motivation in addition to the situation being elusive and/or multidimensional.

Although a dynamic equilibrium may be one of the goals in conflict resolution, the intervention may be initially unbalancing to ultimately permit the participants and forces in the system to establish an optimum equilibrium. Furthermore, it is assumed that the actors in the system, at this level of intervention, have within them the potential for accommodation or adaptation without any significant changing of the nature of their subsystems.

This form of intervention requires, of the social worker, judgments and decisions of a high order which necessitate a strong conceptual and knowledge base. It also requires astute skill and a more disciplined use of the professional self than is required for the aforementioned problem-solving process.

Baccalaureate education should provide the context for a cognitive understanding of conflict resolution, but the M.S.W. worker would be chiefly responsible for the delivery of services on this level.

LEVEL 4: Systems Change

The term, "system," has a large variety of applications, including client personality system, family social system, community systems, institutional systems, and service-delivery systems.

Level 4 systems change is premised upon a careful analysis of the system and subsystems to determine what is dysfunctional or otherwise interferes with goal achievement. After the analysis, systems change may take the form of (1) developing new subsystems; (2) reconstructing the subsystems; or (3) developing a new system, using as many or as few of the previous

subsystems as feasible. The type of systems change utilized will be dependent upon system and subsystem amenability to change and upon a responsible estimation of what changes would restore optimum functioning for those involved in the system.

Any systems change is met with resistance in proportion to the degree it has become institutionalized and to the degree that the system is supportive to other systems.

This level of intervention is the most complex in that components of any system are purposeful and are goal-directed (meet a need) at the point of initiation. Any alteration frequently requires a total system readjustment.

Systems change requires the broadest knowledge base and skill and encompasses such activities as social planning and organization, social action, social policy formulation with feedback mechanisms, and social research.

Workers with a B.A. degree should have a cognitive understanding of this level of intervention, but this area requires the expertise of an M.S.W. worker and might well be a focus for a doctoral sequence. In addition, the doctoral program would consist of hypothesis-testing, expansion of knowledge areas, and development of new frontiers for practice.

Discussion

1. Both the levels of intervention and the corresponding knowledge and skill components are premised on a progression from the simple to the complex, with the complex models requiring the full understanding of the prior levels.

2. The majority of the social services might be rendered in intervention levels 1 and 2. If this model were adopted by the profession of social work, the manpower crisis could be greatly alleviated in most settings by utilizing B.A.s in teams with M.S.W.s who would act as team leaders.

3. Various B.A. workers may perform at levels 3 and 4 intuitively and/or because of specialized training and experiences; the aforementioned matrix alludes to the point when the knowledge components are introduced into the curriculum.

4. The aforementioned matrix of levels of intervention need to be further operationalized by specifying the behavior expected at each level of intervention. Certain behavior at each level of intervention would be more relevant for baccalaureate education and other for advanced education.

5. It is assumed that each level of intervention can be sufficiently specified to operationalize it to practice. A very similar design was used in the N.A.S.W. research-demonstration project at the Connecticut Valley State Hospital. It is recognized, however, that the categories of intervention are not mutually exclusive. For example, systems change may be used in conflict-resolution, problem-solving, or in need provision. Studies have supported the thesis that higher levels of intervention have been frequently used when lower levels would have adequately provided the services.

6. The levels of intervention and the corresponding educational components might provide the bases for an entire continuum of education through B.A., M.A., doctoral, and continuing education programs. If the corresponding bodies of knowledge were tested and confirmed, they could provide tests of competence and/or bases for certification at each of these aforementioned levels.

7. The significant differences between the training of the B.A. and M.S.W. workers would include the following areas: (1) The B.A. graduate would have a cognitive understanding of all levels of the intervention processes but would be expected to have beginning competence in the "need-provision" and "problem-solving" levels of intervention; (2) the B.A. graduate would be oriented to team work in which his skill would be combined with the professional competence of the M.S.W. in the provision of service; (3) the M.S.W. worker would have greater self-objectification and have greater skill in the use of himself in the intervention process; (4) the M.S.W. worker should have sufficiently broad knowledge to consider a wider variety of options at any or all levels of intervention; (5) the education of the M.S.W. should equip him to provide overall leadership of B.A. workers and otherwise assist them in regard to questions of decision-making. The training of the M.S.W. worker should be designed for leadership in the delivery system and conceived as preparation for social statesmanship.

¹ *Manpower Report of the President and a Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor. April, 1967.

² *Closing the Gap in Social Work Manpower.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965.

³ Arthur M. Ross, "Target Populations for Recruitment to Careers in Social Work," *Careers in Social Work 1967 Annual Review.* New York: National Commission for Social Work Careers, 1967.

⁴ *Statistics in Social Work Education, November 1, 1966 and Academic Year 1965-1966.* (Compiled and edited by Raymond DeVera.) New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967.

⁵ Henry J. Meyer, "Professionalization and the Nonprofessional: A Sociological Analysis," paper presented at the N.A.S.W.-A.P.A. Conference on Nonprofessionals in Mental Health Work, May 1967. (Mimeographed.)

⁶ Robert L. Barker and Thomas L. Briggs. *Trends in the Utilization of Social Work Personnel: An Evaluative Research of the Literature.* New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

⁷ A Study of the Use of Social Work Assistants in the Veterans Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery, U.S.V.A., June, 1965.

⁸ Frances Nicholas Smith. "A Study of the Utilization of Non-Professional Personnel: the Social Work Assistant in Veterans Administration." Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Social Work, June, 1968 (unpublished master's thesis).

⁹ "Utilization of Social Work Staff with Different Levels of Education for Family Services in Public Welfare and Selected Illustrative Job Specifications for Local Agency Personnel." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Bureau of Family Services, December, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

¹⁰ Roger A. Armbruster, et al. "A Study of Team Nursing: Implications for

Team Social Work." Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Social Work, June, 1968 (unpublished master's thesis).

¹¹ Edward A. Schwartz and William C. Sample, "First Findings From Midway," *Social Service Review*, Volume 41: 2 (June, 1967), 113-151.

¹² Robert L. Barker and Thomas L. Briggs. *Differential Use of Social Work Manpower: An Analysis and Demonstration Study*. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1968.

¹³ David L. Levine, "Methodology in Developing an Epidemiology for Social Welfare," paper presented at the 89th Annual Forum, National Conference on Social Welfare, New York, May 1962; Levels of Social Work Intervention, Client System Involvement and Worker's Equipment. Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Social Work, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

¹⁴ For a more complete statement see: "Philosophy Screen: A Statement of the Central Objectives for the Education of Social Workers with Special Consideration for Undergraduate Education." Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Social Work, February, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

LEARNING THROUGH FIELD EXPERIENCE

Margaret B. Matson, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Director of Social Welfare Major
The Pennsylvania State University

The invitation to participate in this WICHE workshop was both flattering and challenging. It was flattering to be asked to follow in the footsteps of Mereb Mossman, Ernest Witte, and Cordelia Cox, among others, all of whom have had something to say about field experience in these WICHE institutes. And it was challenging in the assumption that I had something to say about field experience that I had not already included in the publication to which your chairman referred.¹ On both counts I was delighted to be invited, and I have certainly enjoyed participating in the workshop.

I was allowed to pick my own topic within the general area of undergraduate field experience, and I chose to talk about *learning* through field experience. There were other aspects which could have received priority, and I am sure that we will talk about some of them in the question period and perhaps will move into the discussion groups also with other questions.

It seemed to me that there are a number of reasons why the emphasis ought to be on learning. Your chairman has indicated one of them, that if this is to be a meaningful and significant part of the student's educational experience, we have to keep our focus upon learning, not observation, not insignificant kinds of jobs, but the whole question of *learning* through experience. Herbert Bisno indicated this years ago in the Curriculum Study of the Council on Social Work Education,² and he has reiterated it. Many people have tried to focus our attention on this essential component of field experience, and I want to be included in that category.

There are several reasons, in addition, that I chose this particular focus upon learning. First of all, it seems to me that the ultimate justification for placing students in field experience is that it provides for a special kind of learning which cannot be gained in the classroom, in a volunteer experience, or in other ways. Field experience is costly in terms of time, energy, money, and professional competence—all in short supply. And unless there are some superior educational gains—that is, learning opportunities—in field experience, it would be hard to justify such expenditures.

Secondly, I think the emphasis upon learning helps to focus our attention upon the consumer of the educational process—the student—rather than upon other participants in it. All too often we concentrate our attention upon the system—teaching, research, administration, committee process, accreditation requirements, and the like—and give only token recognition that the goal of all of our activity is, or should be, to provide optimal learning conditions for the student.

In terms of role analysis, we have glibly assumed that the teacher-learner role is reciprocal. Perhaps we need to remember that the student role may be carried on independently, and no one can learn independently, but the teacher role cannot. In other words, we cannot perform the role of teacher unless someone else performs the role of learner. We cannot operate without the student; but the student can function in his role as learner even without a teacher. I throw in this small digression simply to reinforce my point that in discussing learning through field experience we are able to maintain a student-oriented perspective.

Third, learning as a focus requires the examination of some quite fundamental questions about the goals and objectives of undergraduate education as a whole in the areas of social welfare and the helping services. I am not one who believes in uprooting the plant periodically to see why it is growing, and I am convinced that a great deal of our self-examination and self-criticism is unjustified, unnecessary, and unproductive.

On the other hand, I think the major question we must ask ourselves constantly and over and over again is "What does the student need to learn, and how can he be helped to learn it?" Phrased a bit differently, we must pose the question "Learning—of what content for what purpose?" The whole area of curriculum is under examination in developing and operating programs in human services when we make decisions about what our objectives are, what we expect the student to learn in field experience, and for what reasons.

Now I want to look more closely with you at these three aspects of learning.

A Special Kind of Learning

Learning in the field is different from classroom learning. As I try to identify some of these differences, perhaps the whole significance of field experience will become a little clearer.

First of all, there are differences in the learning situation in the field experience as compared with the classroom. (If not, we would be hard put to justify a field program.) The question then becomes "Specifically, what are the elements of difference, and what is their significance?"

Let me point out briefly some genuine and significant differences between classroom and field. In the field experience, learning is more direct; it is more immediate and personal than in the classroom. There is a form of tutorial situation which exists between supervisor and student, a direct face-to-face opportunity provided for the discussion of problems and questions raised by the student. The tasks supplied frequently involve specific and immediate undertakings, and the personal element is present to a degree not usually possible in the classroom. So we are talking about a kind of education where there is a direct, immediate, personal contact and, very often, an immediacy in terms of things to be done. All of this helps the student see the significance of what he is doing to a greater extent than learning something in the classroom which may be useful in the future.

Secondly, there is a different type of activity involved in field learning than in the classroom. The field student learns through attending staff meetings and conferences, through accompanying social workers on visits to clients, through visiting courts and agencies and providing transportation and shopping and other services to clients. He may serve as a big brother or big sister to a child; he may lead a group. These are the kinds of things which he does not do in the classroom, involving an activity focus which the student usually welcomes.

Third, the agency focus is upon provision of service rather than the acquisition of knowledge for its own sake. This emphasis upon application tends to de-emphasize rote learning of the kind which many students indulge in, a sort of storage process that they have found useful in passing examinations in connection with their classes. Learning related to provision of service puts a premium upon inquiries into the why and how of situations. It stresses the importance of interpersonal relationships, commitment, and concern. For the first time the student may be made aware of himself as a person who has the potential to be helpful and who needs to learn ways of helping.

Fourth, skill acquisition or enhancement becomes an important area of concern to the student. I am not one who will shy away from talking about teaching skills in field experience or, more accurately, from having a student learn or improve skills.

Communication with persons at a variety of different socioeconomic and ability levels, many of whom are under stress, is a challenge, and the student's communication skills can be enhanced in this kind of experience.

Observation becomes crucial when use is to be made of the recorded observation in supervisory conference or in a case record. Finding the right words to describe and explain a situation, assess behavior, or suggest a course of action is difficult for the student who has previously relied on textbooks for the right words. Recording is a skill which the student can learn in this type of situation and learn it with a direct purpose at hand.

A fifth difference, and an important one, is that, although much learning in the field is of general principles, there is a special focus upon specific situations which are examined within the context of behavior (client's, worker's, student's, supervisor's), and the significance of this behavior. A concept such as authority, for example, is no longer an abstraction when the student is learning about the sources and limits of the agency's authority.

Socialization is something which every introductory sociology student learns about at considerable length, but it does not become a working concept for most students. However, the student in field experience in a correctional institution or a day care center working with children becomes very much aware of the meaning of socialization and the results of inadequate socialization.

Sixth, a very significant difference is in the area of one's own feelings and attitudes. The student in the field experience is required to examine his attitudes and his feelings to an extent which is certainly not characteristic of

most classroom situations. Exposure to subcultures other than his own frequently arouses in the student anxiety about social mores and values. He may question his own feelings about racial, ethnic, and minority groups, about illegitimacy, about illness or aging. He may feel inadequate in the helping role.

Let me just say, parenthetically, that the student who goes into the agency with the vision of himself as an unprejudiced liberal is the one who is going to suffer most in this kind of exposure to situations where he is really challenged. In a classroom discussion about unmarried mothers, for example, he feels nonjudgmental, intellectually secure about facts, and accepting. But the "social problems" approach may not be sufficient to carry him through the actual experience of dealing with illegitimacy, placement of children, and agency provision for financial support.

He may feel overconfident in the beginning in his relationships with clients or agency people; he may over react or over identify with clients. Very frequently there are compromises with the ideal that he sees in terms of agency practice. These may be very troublesome to the beginning student. He may feel hostile toward the agency or his supervisor or both. A part of the learning process will inevitably involve feeling and emotion to a greater extent than is the case in the classroom. With the help of the supervisor and faculty member, the student grows in self-awareness.

The last difference I would like to point out, although I am sure you will think of others, is that this experience provides the student with an opportunity to identify with the "real world." For a specified number of hours each week, he sees people functioning as professionals; he deals with the reality of leading a group or visiting an elderly client or institutionalized child, or in some other way giving service. The quest for identity, a part of the total educational experience, characterizes both classroom and field, but in the latter, in the field, it takes on a new dimension. To the analysis of the kind of learning that takes place in field experience, we might apply the words of T. S. Eliot:

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.

These are some of the differences between classroom and field learning, and I think we can exploit the differences. I think they are an important justification for field experience. One of the key aspects of planning educational content is to make sure that there is some great contrast between what the student does in the field and what he does in the classroom. This is not to say that there should be a divorce between these two areas of his experience. On the contrary, there should be reinforcement in the field of classroom learning and, beyond that, structured experiences that will result in a different type of learning.

Focus Upon the Student

Another justification for field experience is in terms of being able to focus upon the student, and I would like to elaborate a bit upon that.

The recognition of the differences in various kinds of learning will then be capitalized upon, and they will enrich the student's educational experience. He will typically benefit from and welcome a change of pace. After all, he has been in the classroom from the age of six. Learning has been by the assimilation of written materials and lectures, and perhaps he has seen some films, and occasionally he has observed demonstrations and participated in laboratory exercises of various kinds.

All of these are valid ways of learning, but they place no premium upon the involvement of self in any active sense. On the contrary, the student who seeks to inject something of himself into a classroom enterprise may threaten the whole system. Yet he is having significant experiences outside the formal educational system—in jobs, in dormitory living, in peer group relationships, in military service and, increasingly, in marriage at an early age. There must be something of this total self which can be put to active use in the learning process.

The field experience provides for immersion of the total person and provides a bridge between classroom learning and life experiences. In my observation, field experience helps to answer the question of relevance of academic content. Gesell becomes important to the student in a child care agency who observes psychological testing, is assigned to work in a day care center, and participates in the planning conference for a child who can no longer live in his own home.

Life chances of minority group members, urban blight, bureaucracy, and a variety of ideas to which the student has responded somewhat passively on classroom examinations now have relevance within the context of field experience.

Let me quote the comments of a student in a field placement with a child care agency:

I have learned more, seen more, felt more, and understood more in the past three weeks than ever before. The textbooks have come alive. Case records are no longer merely hypothetical situations.

Or another student, again in a child welfare agency:

I have seen families living in filth. I had read about it, but somehow it never existed until I saw it. I have seen the face of a mother whose child told her that he wanted to go back to his mommy, his foster mother. I have cared for an abused baby, on the way home from Children's Hospital, and have wondered how angry an adult must be inside to abuse a baby. I have seen the foster mother and the real mother and realized the conflict—the inadequate legal mother versus the adequate foster mother, with the child caught somewhere in between. And this is going to make such a difference in my grasp of textbook material.

Students are seeking answers to serious questions of relevance and relationship. They call attention through protests and demonstrations (or

dropping out) to what they see as the university's failure to take account of the social issues of the day.

I am not, I hope, naively suggesting that field experience is *the* answer to their questions; in fact, it is quite likely that some students will find the social agency as inadequate as the university in dealing with vital social concerns. Nevertheless, the student in field experience has an opportunity to participate in social welfare or helping service programs and to explore first-hand attempts to deal with problems being experienced by individuals, groups, and communities.

Unwittingly, we prolong the adolescent status of the student in the traditional classroom setting. It is perhaps built into the role of teacher; we are expected to be mature; we must be knowledgeable. Don't we have degrees to prove it? We are in a position of authority and must make evaluative judgments of performance. We imply that productive work will be accomplished when the student leaves the campus, and we tend to forget the increased motivation which comes from successful accomplishment *now*. We insist on a long period of preparation for "something," but we do not provide sufficient opportunity for the student to test the adequacy of that preparation or his fitness for the field he has chosen.

I believe we can correct some of this in field experience, and the structuring of the student's experience ought to provide for some real involvement in issues which he sees as important and in areas of service which he is thinking about as a possible career choice.

One short quotation from a student report in field experience in a probation office will illustrate what I mean about this:

For the first time I am treated as a responsible adult whose opinions are worth listening to. For the first time I feel that I am accomplishing something important.

And when I read that I must say I shuddered to think what the classroom situation had represented to this student. I am not, I hope, condescending to my students, and yet here was one who said, 'For the first time, in field experience, I am an adult.'

The assumption of an adult role is acknowledged in another way by this student:

I must admit that having my own office and phone is a bit awesome. Being accorded the privileges of an adult also implies bearing the responsibilities of one. I still find it difficult to believe that, finally, I am in a position to help others, that I have the knowledge and skill to do something for people

Now I would like to go back to the third aspect of this learning in field experience, the fact that it required us to examine fundamental questions about the goals and objectives of education for the helping services: what content for what purposes? I believe that the new *Guide* of the Council on Social Work Education provides a useful frame of reference.³

You will recall that the council publication outlines four objectives: enrichment of general education, preparation for graduate professional social work education, preparation for immediate employment in social welfare positions, and contribution to the preparation of students for graduate education or beginning employment in other human service occupations. These are general—better education, preparation for professional education in social work, preparation for employment in social welfare, and preparation for graduate work or employment in other areas of the helping services.

Within this context each college or university will need to assess its own priorities and the means to achieve them. Field experience should be examined in terms of its contribution to the student's total education, and I've tried to indicate some of the ways it differs from classroom instruction.

Let me try to be more specific in dealing with one particular area which has been labeled "interventive means." You probably know that this new content area was added to the revised *Guide*. It is under the category of social welfare courses and was added with a statement which can be read in a variety of ways: "A generalized approach to the interventive means in social welfare is recommended rather than separate courses in the various social work methods." Another statement suggests that this content should "prepare students for general problem-solving activities in various social welfare settings." There is a further comment that this should not serve in lieu of agency in-service training.

"Interventive means" is a term of some ambiguity, but I take it to refer to the methods by which help is given to individuals, groups, and communities. It is closely related to direct service and, specifically, it seems to me to be related to the preparation of students for participation in the delivery-of-service system of agencies, institutions, and organizations of both the traditional and innovative varieties.

It is inconceivable to me, with my particular bias about field experience, that a school could attempt instruction in interventive means without a well-developed field experience program. Students in such programs are learning not only the why of interventive means but also how service is delivered. Skill training in data collection, observation, interviewing, and recording is a legitimate component of field experience, and the use of these skills in aspects of service to clients is a desired objective.

Tyler's analysis of curriculum objectives may be helpful here.⁴ Let us assume that a school has decided to adopt the objective of preparing students for beginning employment in any one of the helping service professions. Furthermore, it is convinced that this preparation should include knowledge of the ways in which service is given. I take this to be an aspect of the interventive means.

Tyler, in his curriculum analysis work, tells us that significant change in behavior is the real purpose of education, and that objectives should be statements of changes to take place in students. How, then, can a learning experience in interventive means be structured so that behavioral change will result? What are the tests of a learning experience in this area of inter-

ventive means that would help the student to become prepared for a beginning position?

Tyler gives us some points. They appear in his writings and a publication that Marguerite Pohek did for the council.⁵ I have summarized them again in the pamphlet on field experience, so let me mention them only briefly. According to Tyler, the kind of learning experience that will result in behavioral change must do certain things:

1. Give the student an opportunity to perform the kind of behavior desired.

2. Give him an opportunity to deal with content that is appropriate. Here we are talking about academic content, and again the learning experience will involve not only activity in the sense of performance and doing but also some awareness of the kind of content which is implied in this objective.

3. Be within the capacity of the learner. This is a simple statement, but a very significant one.

4. Build on the past experience of the learner. In this sense we have an obligation in field experience to build upon the classroom experience and life experience of the student, providing continuity.

5. Be interesting to the student and allow him to obtain satisfaction from carrying on the kind of behavior which is required. I have tried to indicate the ways in which I think that field experience offers opportunities for this kind of satisfaction.

6. Provide something that is meaningful in terms of the student's perception of himself and his career. This, of course, is very difficult to accomplish in many classroom situations; although we as teachers may have a very firm conviction about the meaningfulness of a particular set of data to the student, it is hard for him to see the relevance in many instances. It does not become automatic in field experience, but meaningfulness in an immediate sense is more likely to be felt by the student in the area of "interventive means."

7. Provide opportunity for the student to perceive all the necessary aspects for accomplishing the learning task and to bring the parts into a satisfying whole. In other words, we do not withhold some of the components and then expect him to see the whole pattern. On the contrary, the various tasks are structured to enable the student to perceive their interrelationships and their significance to the whole.

8. Give the student some indication of how well he is doing at a particular time so that he can use this in guiding his learning. We have developed this in the classroom, of course, in the form of periodic examinations. In the field this can be done through conferences with supervisor, faculty members, and others, and through the use of diaries and other written materials. Through a variety of techniques, the field experience student can and must get feedback in terms of how he is progressing.

9. Be worked out in the context of good social and personal relations. This does not mean that all must be sweetness and light throughout the learning process. However, harmonious understanding between agency and university or college is essential. The student must be made aware of this harmonious relationship; he must not be victimized by a lack of agreed-upon expectations between the university and the agency.

10. Involve the student in a variety of situations in which he has a chance to practice the desired behavior. Specifically, as far as interventive means are concerned, the field experience must be structured so that the student who is expected to learn observation, interviewing, and recording, for example, has a chance to practice these skills and then has an evaluation of performance. He needs also to savor the satisfaction of direct service through assignments of increasing complexity arranged so that he has an orderly progression in his field experience as he becomes able to utilize his skills at a higher level.

Obviously, cooperation between agency and college or university would be needed in planning a field experience in which these conditions could be met. Orientation to the agency, opportunities to learn its structure and functions, the kinds of problems it deals with, its value system, and its place in the community network of services would be a part of the content. Beyond this, an opportunity to participate actively in the agency program is essential to permit the student to test himself in the helping process and to evaluate the learning experience in terms of career satisfaction.

I shall close by going back in time to 1951, when the Hollis-Taylor volume on social work education was published.⁶ It is a valuable document. When one reads it from the perspective of 1968, there are still many gems to be found. One of them, it seems to me, serves as an ending for what I have presented here this morning. The Hollis-Taylor discussion at the point to which I refer is on the kinds of courses which should be offered at the undergraduate level that would include the informational, philosophic, and attitudinal components of the concepts important to further professional growth in social work. What they say about classroom courses I would also extend to field experiences:

They should provide a maximum of opportunity, compatible with sound scholarship, for each student to develop and express his ideas, feelings, predilections and prejudices about social welfare and social work.

¹ Margaret B. Matson. *Field Experience in Undergraduate Programs in Social Welfare*. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967.

² Herbert Bisno. *The Place of the Undergraduate Curriculum in Social Work Education*. Vol. II, A Project Report of the Curriculum Study. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959.

³ *Undergraduate Programs in Social Welfare—A Guide to Objectives, Content, Field Experience, and Organization*. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967.

¹ Ralph W. Tyler. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

² Marguerite V. Pohek (ed.). *The Teacher's Compendium*. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1963.

⁶ Ernest V. Hollis and A. L. Taylor. *Social Work Education in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

CONTENT FOR METHODS COURSES IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULA FOR THE HELPING SERVICES

Joan Acker, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Community Services
and Public Affairs
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

I'm going to present to you my present thoughts on methods content for undergraduate education for the helping professions. I want to stress that these are my present thoughts about it. These thoughts come out of some proposals that I have developed for the new School of Community Service and Public Affairs at the University of Oregon. The proposals have not been implemented yet; they will be implemented starting this September. They are in the nature of a proposal rather than of tested ways of teaching content and tested kinds of content; so keep that in mind. Some of you have had experience in grappling with methods courses at an undergraduate level. You may think that I'm just out of my head to be suggesting some of these things. I may find that out too, very soon.

A Generic Program

My thinking on this problem is related to the development of our new School of Community Service and Public Affairs. This is an undergraduate school although it probably will have some graduate programs, probably not in traditional areas—not in social work. It is a generic program spanning a wide variety of fields, from public administration to all those occupations and fields that we loosely group under "community service."

We now have a public affairs major which includes a variety of administration options. People may prepare themselves for some rather specialized financial functions in administration, for personnel, and for various other kinds of work. It is very flexible; the student has a lot of opportunity to pick his own way.

We have just established a community service major. In this major we will have a core program, and I can indicate later some of the courses that will be included. Also, students will have an opportunity to specialize to some extent on the undergraduate level with emphasis in corrections, counseling, and social work. We probably will also develop an emphasis in gerontology. We will undoubtedly develop other areas of specialization as time goes on.

In addition to these two majors, we have a recreation major which includes all the traditional subjects in recreation programs and parks management programs but also has a specialization in community arts management. It seems (and I didn't know this until recently) that throughout the country communities are setting up various kinds of community art centers, a rebirth

of the old settlement house but for everybody, not just for the people that need to be integrated into American society. There is a real demand for this kind of person, somebody who has organizational skills, community skills, and also some knowledge about the arts.

Later we may have an urban-planning emphasis or major in the school and probably will have an international development program. This is being worked on now. When I'm talking about generic skills, I'm attempting to talk about skills that span these wide varieties of occupational areas.

World Events Affect Curriculum Content

In order to talk about curriculum content, I always look at the world: How does it fit in? What's going on in our world today that has an impact upon the kinds of methods we're going to teach in undergraduate programs?

The central problems of our society now do have an impact upon what kinds of methods we're going to be teaching. Certainly the Viet Nam war has an impact. It's draining off money and making it hard for us to do a lot of things. It's creating a climate of alienation, withdrawal, denial, and also a climate within which force and violence as solutions to social problems are more readily looked to than are reasonable, reasoned solutions. So it has an impact, I think, on what our students are going to be faced with when they go out and with what we ought to be teaching.

Certainly the rapid, uneven, and unplanned development of technology that we're experiencing in this country has a great deal to do with our problems. Related to this is our skewed allocation of resources between the public and private sectors, making it extremely difficult to deal with all kinds of problems.

Another important factor is the development of a possibly larger, but certainly more depressed, underclass in our society. The beginning revolt of this underclass, along with our failure to solve the problems of racism in our society further complicate the situation. These factors have a tremendous impact upon what we're going to be teaching.

Lastly, we are experiencing in our society an increasing alienation and disaffection among the young people. Increasingly numerous groups feel that the very organization of American society is subverting American values; that, in a sense, the goals of our society have been displaced to the maintenance of our organizations away from the basic concerns with humanity, equality, freedom, etc.

These broad trends relate to the demands that we are facing as educators in this field. When we decide to put meat into our methods courses and decide what we're actually going to be teaching, we have to meet diverse kinds of demands arising out of some of these factors.

Demands Educators Must Face

We face a demand, as educators, on three levels. We face three types of demands. There is the effective demand, that all of you know about,

to fill thousands of jobs. We've been responding to this demand for several years; we are convinced now that we ought to meet that demand.

Secondly, there is the demand to solve social problems in a more effective way than we have been doing in the past. This is not necessarily synonymous with the demand for people to fill particular slots. This is a demand we are feeling most from the organized groups of clients, from the people who most need the kinds of services that we are supposed to be giving.

Thirdly, as educators we face the demand from our own client group—the students, those who want to find a meaningful role in society. Some of them are alienated; some aren't. We have a lot of premature cynics who are extremely difficult to deal with in many ways. We have student revolts at Oregon and everywhere else. But we have to meet their demands in some ways.

Some Assumptions

I make some assumptions that I would like to make clear. They are related to the kinds of demands we are facing. First, in the future we are going to prepare at the B.A. level most of the people who are actually involved in giving services. This is true now, as you know. Most people who give service do not have graduate degrees and probably never will have graduate degrees. Therefore, there are lots of things we have to keep at the undergraduate level, and we have to expect a change in function for the people who are more highly trained at a master's or Ph.D. level.

We have to do this—and I make the assumption that we are going to do this—because students are demanding it. They don't just want to be sensitive and self aware and be able to write good reports. They want to be able to do something. I think one of the reasons we're having trouble, we middle-aged conservatives, with kids these days is that, for a larger and larger group of people we are not providing any kind of useful social role. It's hard to expect that adults are going to be satisfied with being children. If we're going to send 90 percent of our people to college, it's going to get worse—worse and worse. That's my first assumption.

My second assumption is that we can no longer think of preparing professionals who are narrowly specialized in one method, or tied to one theoretical approach, or tied to one model of the professional, such as the therapist, for example. Our society is demanding more effective intervention. This forces us to stop doing the same old things without doing them any more effectively. It forces us to be receptive to new theories and methods, in the sense of maintaining a healthy skepticism which will help us to avoid new kinds of orthodoxies. We are always in danger of developing some new orthodoxy.

I also make the assumption, which I have already alluded to, that there are common elements in the role requirements for a wide variety of professions and fields of practice which make it possible for us, on the undergraduate level, to provide a generic methods education.

Realities to Face

When developing methods content for the School of Community Service and Public Affairs, I looked at what happens to people when they actually go to work. The WICHE conferences that I attended, at which we had agency people, were extremely helpful in this. What are the realities of functioning for people at the B.A. level in the helping profession? We have to tell our students how it really is and prepare them for it, not kid them about what it's going to be like.

First of all, professionals in our society function in some sort of organizational context. Most of our students are going to work in bureaucratic organizations. Some will work in less bureaucratic organizations than others. Some may be attached to organizations which are dominated by clients rather than by community influentials or by governmental bureaucrats. But whatever the context, it's going to be an organizational context. I'm convinced that we need to educate people for organizational expertise. They have to know how to work in these organizational contexts.

Let me elaborate on what I mean by organizational expertise. We often talk about aspects of organizational expertise when we develop criteria for student or professional functioning. We usually call it something like "awareness of agency limitations, ability to relate to a supervisor, etc." This is a part of it. However, our students also need to question agency limitations and to question the supervisory function. They need to be aware of the limitations but only in the sense of adapting to them. They need to know when to adapt and when to kick up their heels.

Organizational expertise involves many other abilities. First is the ability to assess the authority structure of the organization, to assess the channels of influence within this authority structure, to assess one's own position in this bureaucratic structure (what one's realistic potentials for action are and where the blockages are apt to come).

Students need a sensitivity to the necessity for a thorough knowledge of the rules of the game, both the explicit rules of the agency, whatever they might be, and the implicit ones. They need to know how to use these rules creatively for their clients.

You probably all know of Blau's study of organizational structure and professional functioning, in which he points out that the experienced public welfare worker who has been around for a while learns something; he learns creative use of the rules in the interest of the client. Perhaps we can help people to do this explicitly rather than, if they survive in the organization, learn how to do it through experience only. Going along with this, I would say that students need to have a great sensitivity to the manifest goals of the agency, to the way the organization relates to these goals and how it probably subverts them in some way or another.

Students also need the ability to assess potential sources of support, both within and outside the organization. They should recognize that changes in bureaucratic organizations often come from external pressures and

that, in order to be productive, they need to be in a position to help to implement these changes. I'm not saying they should get out in the picket line, or that they should act as subversives within the organization. They can recognize that external pressures have an effect upon the organization and that many changes will probably come that way. However, no protest movements mean anything unless changes can eventually be implemented and made part of the ongoing structure. Therefore, it is extremely important to have knowledgeable people who can consolidate these changes and implement them in terms of organizational structure. That's my first point in the analysis of the organizational context to professional practice.

My second point is this: Professional practice involves a variety of social roles. None of us does just one kind of thing. In the past we have trained people to do one kind of thing or to identify professional practice as one kind of thing. But in reality a professional goes from a staff meeting to a one-to-one encounter with a client, to a one-to-one encounter with a supervisor or supervisee, depending upon who he is, to participation with a group of clients who are trying to work on a problem of theirs, to other kinds of group situations.

Professional practice demands role virtuosity, a recognition that each role that the person plays is a legitimate part of professional functioning and that different behaviors may be called for in different roles. This is true of welfare departments or the agencies with which most of us are usually identified. It's true also of the city manager. It's true of people working in urban renewal agencies and in many other settings.

The helping professional is involved in interaction systems of varying complexity. Dyadic situations, small groups, formal organizations, and communities would be one way of putting it. At each system level there are distinct types of reciprocal roles, the main divisions between them being the professional-client role and the professional-nonclient role. This means, of course, as I have indicated, role relationships with all kinds of people who are involved in the problem-solving process. This may go all the way from people in the administrative structure to the business man. I want to say parenthetically that I feel that the concept of change agent which has been used very often lately to describe the professional role is too limited a concept. The concept of change agent as Lippitt uses it in the book *Dynamics of Planned Change* views the change agent as somebody from outside coming in to act upon the client system. I think the professional role also involves instituting changes within the system of which the professional is an integral part. In other words he is not always acting from outside.

A third characteristic of professional practice is that it is problem-oriented, and that the nature of the problem is always related to the kinds of methods used.

What kind of intervention strategies can we teach people at the undergraduate level that will help them to function in these kinds of professional situations? Strategies of intervention should be seen as part of a generic problem-solving process. I would like to see our students develop a habit of mind in which every situation is viewed as problematic.

Every situation is a problem-solving situation. I know that I am questioning the assumption that functioning is enhanced if we can internalize behavior, develop habit patterns that become nonthoughtful. I think, though, that much of our difficulty in effecting social change is that we have internalized much of our behavior, and we don't think about it any more. We don't view every situation as a problem. We don't attempt to consciously analyze what's going on. I'd like to teach students how to do this by explicitly introducing them at the beginning level in a methods course to a problem-solving process, a process which they would apply to varying system levels, to an individual problem, to a small group problem, to a community problem, etc. I'd like to teach them to explicitly identify the relevant variables in defining the problem, to gather data, to observe, etc.

The explicit formulation of goals, either with the client or, if that is not appropriate, with other people in the problem-solving process, is the next step. It's not very easy to formulate goals. Students should be aware that there will often be lack of consensus, disagreement on goals, or that there may be agreement on some goals and disagreement on others. Students need to develop some ability to give and take in this process of goal-setting. Also involved in the process of goal-setting is assessment of resources for problem-solution. Power and the way it is distributed in each concrete situation, is one of the most important resources to be assessed.

You can't set goals, it's silly to set goals that are impossible; only possible goals should be set. (We could have an argument on this.) Goals may not always be change goals; this is another reason I prefer not to use the term "change agent." Our goals may be to maintain the status quo. Right now, as a matter of fact, when so many programs are being attacked, if we could just maintain the status quo we would be doing rather well. I doubt that we can even do that. So it could be very important to maintain the status quo. It could also be very important to simply facilitate some ongoing process which is a positive one.

The next step in a rational problem-solving scheme might be to plan to take action. Here's where our strategies of intervention will come in. The final step is evaluating action outcomes and then feeding back the evaluation into the original definition of the problem. This is an important step. In social work we have usually overlooked this part of the process because it's a very difficult thing to do. Students should develop a commitment to evaluation along with an appreciation of the difficulties in making useful assessments of action.

Intervention Strategies

What about the kinds of intervention strategies that might come into a problem-solving process at the point that you come to some goals and are ready to act? First of all I want to talk about basic skills in intervention. These skills are used at every stage of the problem-solving process. It is somewhat inaccurate to talk about them as part of strategies of intervention to be used at the implementation stage.

The first skills needed are talking skills, one-to-one talking skills. I'm not sure I want to use the word interviewing, but you might use that word. I'm talking about talking and listening skills in a wide variety of situations, with a wide variety of people from different cultural backgrounds, different sexes and ages, and different organizational positions. I'm talking about recognition of nonverbal signs as well as verbal signs. (And, by the way, at Oregon we're going to institute a course on nonverbal communication, taught by an anthropologist.) We need to train people specifically to do these things.

At Oregon we have already started in the freshman year. We have a course that we're calling "Career Analysis Workshop." In this course students meet in small groups of from 10 to 12 students to examine the range of professions available to them, to examine their own values, attitudes, and wishes. They get out into the community and meet people who are actually working in these areas. We hope they will begin to come to some conclusion about whether or not they ought to even go into community service, for example, or whether they'd be better off running a computer.

In the context of this course, students will start to learn interviewing skills. They will also start to learn another basic skill, the skill of functioning well and comfortably in a small group. This is the second basic skill which we need consciously to teach. People don't just automatically function comfortably in small groups, nor do they automatically help others to function well in small groups. We're hoping to begin on the freshman level in teaching at least the beginning skills in one-to-one and small group processes.

Organization and expression of ideas, orally and in written form, are also basic skills. Students should have learned these skills by the time they come to college. Many have not learned them. Many still do not organize their ideas well and present them coherently after four years at college. Although I feel terrible about saying that we ought to teach people verbal and written communication at the college level, that is what I have to say.

Another basic skill is what some call an empathic ability, an ability to feel with other people, an ability to take the role of others. I don't think that this means only feeling. It also has a component of understanding the organizational constraints there are upon other people.

Particularly at this stage, we have to be very conscious about dealing with the relationships between blacks and whites in our society. I want to emphasize this because, although I haven't been here very long, I haven't heard anybody say anything about it. There are many unconscious behavior patterns white people evidence in their relationships with dark-skinned people which cause difficulties in interaction in a professional situation. We can't expect these patterns to just vanish.

I'm assuming that most of our students are white. We ought to be working on that also. It's shocking to find out the degree to which universities and colleges in this country have not done anything about recruiting Negro students into their schools. We have just had a big go-

round about this at Oregon and got some reports of other places. In big metropolitan areas as well as at Oregon, there has been practically nothing done although it has been evident for a long time, quite evident, that this is a problem.

These, then, are the basic skills. Let me be more specific about skills useful to the beginning worker, the bottom man in the bureaucratic structure.

I think we need more training in one-to-one skills, giving and getting information with clients, supervisors, and other people in the environment. I think that we can teach our students simple reinforcement techniques to use both with supervisors and clients.

Also, we can teach some basic teaching skills. A lot of what our students are going to be doing involves teaching. We need to develop skills in bargaining and negotiation, persuasion, etc.

What about group skills? By building on some experiences with small groups that develop comfort in those groups, students can learn how to organize task-oriented groups such as committees, problem-solving groups of various kinds, and client groups. They can learn how to help other people learn group interactions, facilitate group interactions.

What about organizational skills? I've already talked about some of those. We also can teach policy-making skills at a beginning level. Our students can learn something about getting policy information, about organizing community groups, about implementation of policy, or how to get policy through, about how to write a policy proposal, how to testify about it, whom to see. They can even get some experience, or at least simulated experience, in doing this kind of thing.

I have been emphasizing conflict kinds of skills rather than collaborative skills. I have been doing this for a purpose—not that I don't think we need the collaborative skills; I think we do. But if we are going to train people to be change agents as well as people who battle to maintain what's being taken away, we have to develop people who can engage in conflict.

In our society, we tend to view consensus as very desirable and conflict, at least in professional interaction, as being abnormal or bad, unethical. What we actually do is mask conflict in an effort to get consensus. This, in turn, tends to support the status quo—that is, you don't let people really disagree or examine change alternatives.

I don't know about your groups, but in my observation of a number of different groups in which I happen to be, when conflict comes up, people are very upset. They pretend that everybody agrees, or they wait until it all goes away somehow, and then we can talk about it. They just cannot adjust to the fact that they're in a conflict situation; they think everyone ought to agree. It's only right that we should agree, you know? Well, this really is not reality.

Students should be aware of some of the social mechanisms which tend to mask conflict. One is that we won't talk about an issue until we have consensus on it. Vidich and Bensman describe this beautifully in *Small Town*

in Mass Society. They tell about a town council, which never actually brought anything to a vote until, behind the scenes, they reached agreement. This meant that most of the time they didn't do anything. Sometimes other organizations stepped in and did it. Sometimes the situation changed so there was no longer a problem. Other times things got to be so bad that a real crisis occurred which forced action.

This is what's happening to us now. This is what's really happening to white society. We pretended that there was no conflict for so long. But, it wouldn't go away. Now we're being forced into action. This happens in small groups; it happens everywhere.

Another way of masking conflict is cooptation, bringing people into authority positions in some way, or cooptation as just a pat on the back and a little bit of friendliness. You don't like to disagree with a guy who is so nice to you, especially if he happens to be your superior. I think we ought to be aware of this.

There is a fear of loss of effectiveness also that operates in groups to keep people from expressing disagreement. Open confrontation is often viewed as tremendously risky because it will destroy the pleasant feelings, and you won't be effective any more, and no one will listen to you. Sometimes this happens, but it doesn't always happen. I think we can clue people in to this.

There are many indications that we are beginning to look at our role as a conflict role part of the time. Articles, such as the recent one by George Breger about the social worker as advocate rather than enabler, are discussing a conflict role. I don't think this is the only role; I only emphasize it because it has been de-emphasized.

Another reason for emphasizing it is that many of our students are women, and women, in general, are less socialized into taking aggressive conflict stances in any situation. If a woman gets into a controversy situation and gets really pushed by a man in an argument, the woman usually backs down first, regardless of whether or not she thinks she's right. She also may be so damaged that she's not sure whether she's right or not. So we need to toughen up our students so that they can take a stand on controversial issues.

We need to consider ethical and value issues involved in using various kinds of approaches, and this will be a part of our methods courses. It will, in addition, be dealt with in other places in the curriculum. You might say that I'm talking about teaching people how to manipulate other people, how to coerce other people. I don't really think I am, but we could argue that.

Let me indicate briefly how we are going to try to do this. We are going to initiate a three-term course beginning in the fall of 1968 which will be called "Strategies of Intervention." We will teach one-to-one processes—interviewing, talking, observing, listening, and hearing. We will also teach reinforcement techniques to some extent, at least an introduction of that. We will teach small-group processes and we will, in the third term, have an introduction to functioning in organizations and communities.

In addition to these courses, most of our students will take some specialized fourth-term course in an area in which they have particular interest. For example, we might have a fourth-term course in personnel management; we might have a fourth-term course in working with delinquent adolescents; we might have a fourth-term course in rural community development. In other words, we will apply some of the basic skills to particular practice settings, to particular kinds of client populations, to particular kinds of problems. I don't know how much we can accomplish in these terms; I'd like to look at it a year from now and report to you.

Some Problems We Face

Other problems remain in the approach we are taking at Oregon. One is the problem of whether this attempt to give a broad methods introduction is going to be overwhelming to the student, leaving him without any sense of competence. My thinking about this now is that feelings of competence will be supported by the experience that students get in other areas, in their field experience, in other courses in the school such as the Career Analysis Workshop, and another course that we are planning which will be called "The Professional and His Practice."

In this course we will deal with a wide variety of professions and the organizational contexts within which practice takes place. I think that now we are turning out noncompetent people, not necessarily incompetent, but people who don't have any competencies. If we can develop some interpersonal skills, some organizational expertise in our products, we'll be doing more than we have done previously. I think we all know that people who are really successful are those who have interpersonal and organizational skills.

Another problem is that of the professional *vs.* the bureaucratic orientation. Can a generic approach develop a sufficiently strong professional identity, an identity which will protect a practitioner from becoming an uncritical supporter of the bureaucracy within which he works? Can it give him the tools he needs to maintain a client-problem commitment? I think it probably can although we have disagreement on this. Our resolution of the problem at this point has been one in which we have a social work emphasis, for example, a counseling emphasis, to help students develop a professional identity.

The whole thing about hanging loose on method and theory is a problem. Would it be better to tell students, "This is the way you do it, kid, and you're going to be real competent when you get out?" Some people think you ought to do this with undergraduates, but I don't think so. I think it's dishonest because we all know that the reality is that we don't know how to do things very well and that we have to keep looking for new ways.

A final question relates to the consequences of giving students all this criticism of organizations. Will it lead to sophistication and a better ability to handle the situation or will it lead to cynicism and manipulation? I think that, on the whole, it will enhance functioning, but I must see what happens with our students. One of my consultants at Oregon, an organizational

sociologist, thought you shouldn't tell people these things about how organizations work, because if you tell them, they'll either manipulate it for their own ends or they'll be so discouraged before they ever start that they'll simply retire or go into something else. We're going to try to do an evaluation of our program at Oregon to answer some of these questions and other questions too. I don't know what the outcome will be. We are optimistic.

PARTICIPANTS

WICHE HELPING SERVICES WORKSHOP May 15-17, 1968 - Salt Lake City, Utah

ALASKA

George P. Spartz
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology and Sociology
University of Alaska
College, Alaska 99701

ARIZONA

Naomi Harward
Associate Professor
Sociology Department
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Dr. David W. Smith
Professor and Director
Rehabilitation Center
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Milton Slaybaugh
Instructor in Rehabilitation
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

CALIFORNIA

Dr. Francis Purcell
Director
San Francisco State College
School of Social Work
San Francisco, Calif. 94132

Raymond E. Hillis
Assistant Professor
Rehabilitation Counseling Program
California State College at Los Angeles
5151 State College Dr.
Los Angeles, California 90032

Don R. Schrader
Coordinator
Rehabilitation Counsel
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

Ann J. Harper
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
San Diego State College
San Diego, California 92115

Dr. Gerald West
Department of Counseling
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California 94132

COLORADO

Dr. Garth Eldredge
Director
Undergraduate Program in Rehabilitation
and Related Services
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado 80631

Dr. Richard Ingraham
Director
Helping Services
Metropolitan State College
250 W. 14th Ave.
Denver, Colorado 80204

Sister Gabriel Mason
Chairman
Psychology Dept.
Loretto Heights College
3001 S. Federal
Denver, Colorado 80236

Dr. Eugene Koprowski
Associate Dean
School of Business, Production and Manpower
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

IDAHO

Irene A. Wilcox
Assistant Professor
Boise College
Boise, Idaho 83701

Dr. Herbert G. Lingren
Department of Sociology
Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho 83201

J. M. Calonico
Instructor
Sociology/Anthropology
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

MONTANA

Dr. Morton Arkava
Associate Professor
Social Welfare
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

Laura Nicholson
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

NEVADA

Dr. Bernard Greenblatt
Coordinator
Helping Services Program
Nevada Southern University
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

NEW MEXICO

Dr. Jerome Levy
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychiatry
University of New Mexico
School of Medicine
930 Stanford, N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

OREGON

Dr. Daniel Jennings
Associate Professor of
Social Work
Portland State College
School of Social Work
1632 S.W. 12th St.
Portland, Oregon 97207

Ronald C. Waller
Associate Professor
Coordinator,
Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Training
School of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Rev. James E. Kelly, Ph.D.
Chairman
Dept. of Sociology
University of Portland
5000 N. Williamette Blvd.
Portland, Oregon 97203

UTAH

Kenneth K. Keiser, ACSW
Coordinator
Undergraduate Social Welfare Emphasis
Department of Sociology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Vern K. Kupfer
Professor of Psychology
Chairman
Behavioral Science
College of Southern Utah
Cedar City, Utah 84720

Professor Walter C. Neville
Chairman
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

Robert Ashpole
Lecturer
Sociology Department
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dr. Tharel R. Black
Chairman
Department of Sociology and Social Work
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84321

Ray Clark
Coordinator
Social Service Sequence
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

Dr. Joseph N. Symons
Coordinator
Undergraduate Program in Social Work
Department of Sociology
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

WASHINGTON

Rt. Rev. Gerald Desmond
Head, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
St. Martins' College
Olympia, Washington 98501

RESOURCE FACULTY

Thomas Briggs, Professor
School of Social Work
Syracuse University
926 South Crouse Avenue
Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

Dr. Joan Acker
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Margaret Matson
Professor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pa. 16802

GROUP LEADERS

FACULTY

Jerry Kelley
Assistant Dean
School of Social Work
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Patricia Pickford
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
Fresno State College
Fresno, Calif. 93726

Kay L. Dea
Consultant
Undergraduate Education
Council on Social Work Education
Assistant Professor
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dr. J. A. Schiller
Chairman
Dept. of Sociology
Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, Washington 98447

PRACTICE RESOURCE PERSONS

AGENCY ADMINISTRATION

David L. Ashmore
Director
Staff Development Office
Colorado State Dept. of Public Welfare
1600 Sherman
Denver, Colorado 80203

Bernard Kogon
Director
Staff Training Office
Los Angeles County Probation Dept.
P.O. Box 4002 Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, Calif. 90054

Paul E. Jarvis, Ph.D.
Psychology Consultant
Staff Development Department
Fort Logan Mental Health Center
3520 West Oxford Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80236

George P. Spartz
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology and Sociology
University of Alaska
College, Alaska 99701

STATE PERSONNEL DIRECTOR

Edward Himstreet
State Personnel Director
130 State Capitol
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

RESOURCE CONSULTANTS

Joseph Rowell
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Federal Office Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94101

Eulene Hawkins
Regional Staff Development Specialist
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
19th and Stout Streets
Denver, Colorado 80202

Theodore E. Fasso
Consultant in Psychiatric Social Work
NIMH
Room 9017
Federal Office Bldg.
19th and Stout Streets
Denver, Colorado 80202

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN THE HELPING SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Thomas Brigham
Dean
Graduate School of Social Work
Fresno State College
Fresno, California 93726

Dr. Charles Browning
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
Whittier College
Whittier, California 90601

Dr. Gordon Hearn (Chairman)
Dean
School of Social Work
Portland State College
Portland, Oregon 97207

Dr. John Lillywhite
Professor
Department of Sociology
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99163

Dr. Parnell McLaughlin
Director
Department of Rehabilitation
Department of HEW
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dr. Rex Skidmore
Dean
School of Social Work
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dr. Eugene Koprowski
Associate Dean
School of Business
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302